

NormanCenterCityVision

Center City Vision Steering Committee Meeting Minutes
Friday, August 13, 2015 1:30 PM
Municipal Building Study Session

Members in Attendance:

Jim Adair
Susan Connors
Judy Hatfield
Stephen Tyler Holman
Becky Patten
Daniel Pullin
Cindy Rogers
Mayor Cindy Rosenthal
Jonathan Fowler
Richard McKown (2:40)

City Staff in Attendance:

Anaïs Starr
Jolana McCart

The meeting began at 1:40 pm.

Susan Connors went over the Options for Center City Form Based Code handout. (See attached)

A. PROCESS

Comments on each process proposal:

1. *Approve the Center City Form Based Code as an optional Overlay District.*
 - Throw out this option (3)
 - Pretty useless
2. *Approve the Center City Form Based Code as a voluntary but preferred Overlay District.*
 - Why required to rezone to a PUD? (You must specifically identify the development you are looking at.)
 - Questionable
 - Make opt out more onerous
3. *Approve the Center City Form Based Code as a mandatory Overlay District.*
 - Concern about lack of notification for a zoning change. (A notification process could be used.)
 - A Certificate of Conformity Application process is not used now.
 - Takes the rights away from property owners

- Throw out this option (1)
- Keep (1)

4. *Approve the Center City Form Based Code as a new Zoning District and rezone the property within the boundaries of the Center City Vision Project.*

- Throw out this option (2)
- Suggestion to add: “If an applicant chooses not to opt into the overlay district in its entirety, the applicant must rezone to a PUD and incur the elements of the FCB to the maximum degree as financially feasible.”

B. INCENTIVES

- If the process is 100% right, people will want to do it. Incentives will not be needed.
- Real incentive = density
- Need positive incentives instead of negative incentives
- Budget impact would need to be considered before establishing a TIF
- Add 2c to address not just square footage, but storefront.
- Why waive impact fees? Perhaps reduce for a time period of 5 years with option to extend to 10?
- “Property Tax Abatement” instead of TIF
- If this process is made mandatory, why are incentives even needed?

C. PUD REQUIREMENTS

- PUD could be redefined in a different way. Perhaps set up a CCPD instead of a PUD, with different requirements.
- This will not work without the use of alleys.
- Must have some parking available off the alley.
- Street space is identical to a PUD.
- City Council could look at this as a flexible environment.
- Neighborhood services in context of the area.

D. DEVIATIONS AND VARIANCES

No discussion

E. APPEALS

- Appeals should go to the Planning Commission; then appealed to City Council if needed.

F. STREET, BLOCKS AND ALLEYS

- Alleys should always be maintained and not vacated or closed, unless receiving City Council approval.
- Building over the alley would be allowed.

General questions/comments:

What if the university buys property in the selected area? The City would lose their jurisdiction.

If you make this mandatory, people will fight, thinking they have had something taken from them. If you make it preferred and people choose to do it around you, peer pressure may cause you to choose it also. It's a softer way to get to the end result. Campus Corner was cited as an example.

Optimistic that the preferred will drive the effort, but the person that opts out has the same pull/power. How do we push upward if it isn't mandatory?

Mandatory is certain; uncertainty defeats the process. Decisions are made based on what the rules are. Mandatory puts everyone on the same playing field. Mandatory must show an economic advantage.

How convincing has the evidence been, should the process go as far as #3, that the nature and quality of the developments that are allowed under form based code would be profitable? (Residential side could be proven; commercial proof uncertain)

Required building line as currently stated, is not right – it's urban renewal. Defined criteria for demo would need to be set.

Mandatory discourages new development. How is re-development defined?

Very strong desire to maintain neighborhoods. It's about community more than developers.

Perhaps voluntary now, mandatory later?

- Mayor: There are items in the incentive list that are too complicated to achieve in the near future. What if we went with option #2, which is voluntary but preferred and to encourage you into the preferred category, will consider building fee and impact fee reduction for a 5 year period, make demo easier, include fast tracking. If you choose not to and stay with the existing code, you will need to go to City Council and Planning Commission with the burden of proof to prove why it isn't financially feasible. At the end of the five years, the options would be there to renew, extend the waivers, or make the process mandatory. This recognizes that we do not have all the tools in place right now but we want to get this off the ground.

Susan Connors will pull together information and send this out to the committee in a week or two. Another meeting will be scheduled in approximately a month to wrap up the steering committee's public documents in preparation of public presentations. The consultants will be contacted to fix the document.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 pm.

